

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant acknowledges, with thanks, the office action dated June 2, 2008. The Examiner's withdrawal of the finality of the prior office action is noted with appreciation. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19, and 21-24 are currently pending.

Claims 9, 11, and 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 9 has been amended to include means adapted for processing each job received into each destination queue in accordance with the document processing functionality associated therewith. As such, this claim and its dependent claims are not directed to software per se and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19, and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,897,260 to Zingher (*hereinafter*, "Zingher") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0182575 to Korfanta (*hereinafter*, "Korfanta"). In view of the amendments and arguments set forth below, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct over the art of record.

The subject application is directed to a system and method for distribution a document to at least one destination. Document data representative of an electronic document is received for distribution. Each of a plurality of destination queues are associated with a unique document processing functionality. A job is created by appending to the document data at least one printer job language command, wherein the printer job language command includes instructions for the distribution of the job by a document distribution queue and destination data specifically identifying at least one final output destination for printing of the electronic document. The electronic document with the appended printer job language command is communicated to the document processing queue, wherein the appended printer job language is parsed. The job, inclusive of the printer job language, is then distributed to at least one destination queue specified within the printer job language based on the parsed printer job language command. Each job received into each destination queue is processed in accordance with the document processing functionality associated therewith.

Zingher is directed to a print job allocation system wherein incoming documents are routed via distribution dictated by a single print job processor. The processor analyzes the job and makes a determination as to which of a plurality of printing machines should complete the

job. Conversely, the subject application uses PJL to determine as to which queue to which a document is to be routed. Thus, routing is done to a queue in accordance with PJL commands. Printing functionality associated with each particular queue is performed automatically on documents that are routed to that queue. Stated differently, rather than merely performing an operation, such as printing, e-mailing, facsimile transmission, or the like in accordance with commands, such as PJL commands, the subject application employs two queues. The first queue analyzes the PJL commands, and determines which of plural, available destination queues to which the document should be routed. Each queue has associated with it unique functionality. By way of further example, one queue suitably is a facsimile gateway. Any document routed to that queue will be sent via fax. The PJL which routes the document to this queue does not need to specify a fax. It merely sets a destination queue. If that same queue were to be altered to instead e-mail documents, then the document would be e-mailed when routed to that queue, even though the PJL commands are the same as before. Thus, the subject application allows for hierarchical queue routing wherein document processing is dictated by attributes associated with a destination queue. This is far removed from the teachings of Zingher, wherein the print processor itself analyzes a document to determine where it concludes best for printing.

Amendment has been made to each of independent claims 1, 9 and 17 to render more clear the distinctions over the art of record. As amended, all claims now include limitations wherein routing is done via PJL associated with hierarchical queues, which destination queues have document processing functionality associated therewith.


The deficiencies in the teachings of Zingher relative to the amended claims are not remedied by any teachings of Korfana, which teaches use of PJL but not for purposes of routing documents as provided in the amended claims.

In accordance with the afore-noted amendments and comments, it is submitted that all claims are patentably distinct over the art, and in condition for allowance thereover. An early allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/33336.

Date: September 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



John X. Garred
Registration No. 31,830
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3340
Fax: (216) 592-5009